

International Symposium

The Treaty of Aachen, AD 812:
The Origins and Impact on the Region between
the Adriatic, Central, and Southeastern Europe

Abstracts

University of Zadar
Zadar, September 27–29, 2012



Abstracts

of the International Symposium

The Treaty of Aachen, AD 812: The Origins and Impact on the Region between the Adriatic, Central, and Southeastern Europe

Zadar, September 27–29, 2012

University of Zadar
Department of History



2012

Frankish *ducatu*s or Slavic Chiefdom? The Character of Borna's Polity in Early-Ninth-Century Dalmatia

Denis Alimov

Borna's polity, attested by Frankish sources on the territory of the former Roman province of Dalmatia in the first quarter of the 9th century, is traditionally considered to be the cradle of early medieval Croatian state. Meanwhile, the exact character of this polity and the way it was linked with the Croats as an early medieval *gens* remain obscure in many respects. I argue that Borna's *ducatu*s consisted of two political entities, the Croat polity proper, with its heartland in the region of Knin, and a small chiefdom of the *Guduscani* in the region of Gacka. Borna was the chief of the Croats, a group of people that gradually developed into an ethnic unit under the leadership of a Christianized military elite. For all that, the process of the stabilization of the Croats' group identity originally connected with the social structures of *Pax Avarica* and its transformation into what can be called gentile identity was very durable, the rate of the process being considerably slower than the formation of supralocal political organization in Dalmatia. Evidence about the important institutions of Borna's *ducatu*s, such as *praetoriani* and *castella*, points to the existence of all the necessary conditions for transforming the polity into an early state with an administrative apparatus based on the ruler's retinue of warriors. Meanwhile, when conceptualized as a local form of Central European secondary state formation in the 9th century caused by the collapse of the Avar qaganate and the Carolingian expansion, Borna's *ducatu*s can be interpreted as a political formation that differed greatly from other post-Avar polities. The rapid reinforcement of the post-Avar Knin elite that led to the formation of Borna's *ducatu*s should be explained by external impulses connected with a considerable change in political conditions in the Western Balkans following the expansion of the Franks rather than by any internal social factors. Knin warriors who had served in Charlemagne's wars may have helped establish the effective military organization necessary for the control over territories difficult of access. The territorial growth of the Knin polity led to the actualization of the antique infrastructure that favored the formation of a territorial organization of power based on *zhupanias*. Thus, both the historical context and the local social background facilitated the implementation of the Carolingian model of *Herrschaft* in post-Avar Dalmatia. This prevented Borna's *ducatu*s from transforming into a state of the so-called 'Central European type'. The status of Borna, whose *ducatu*s was formed based on the local post-Avar political structure, was in no way identical to that of an ordinary Frankish governor, nor can he be considered a typical gentile chief.

Imperial Interaction and Local Autonomies

Mladen Ančić

Starting from David Ludden's idea of "Empire as process," I analyse modes of imperial interaction on the Adriatic after the Treaty of Aachen was signed in 813. I interpret this interaction up to the mid 820s as a specific case of imperial fusion, or more specifically, as an attempt to "incorporate peripheries in a unitary framework of centralized imperial management." This was done through acts of imperial interaction and negotiation, as was the case in 817 when Byzantine ambassadors arrived in Aachen and there obtained the intervention of the imperial court in order to implement the provisions of the Aachen treaty. The repertoire of imperial actions also included the implementation of tight political control, as exemplified in the imperial war with Liudevit, Duke of *Pannonia Inferior* at the beginning of the 820s. Failure of similar attempts in later times, starting from the late 820s, led to a prolonged process of transformation of imperial peripheries into a system of imperial borderlands, where a number of political units slowly gained a degree of autonomy. The first on this path was Venice, whose autonomy was symbolically sealed with the appropriation of the relics of St. Mark. A similar process of attaining political autonomy is perceptible on the eastern coast of the Adriatic, where the city of Zadar gained an autonomous position while the smaller towns entered the orbit of this Croatian dukedom. Last to enter the path of political autonomy was the Croatian Dukedom, which securely stayed in the Frankish political orbit until the dissolution of the empire in the 880s. This process resulted in the formation of autonomous political organisms known as the *provincia Veneciarum*, *provincia Jadertina*, and Croatian Dukedom, which survived through the centuries of the early Middle Ages and eventually built their own Adriatic network of political interaction.

New Evidence for the Re-establishment of the Adriatic Dioceses in the late Eighth Century

Ivan Basić

Starting from a supposed connection between the relics of the saints and historical events on the eastern Adriatic at the turn of the 8th century, continuing with the relation of these events to artistic heritage preserved in the cities of Dalmatia and Istria, I discuss the question of when and under what circumstances new bishoprics were founded or old Early Christian episcopal seats re-established in these cities. Beginning with the possibility that some or all of these cities achieved their episcopal status at the end of the 8th c., I examine the viewpoints of earlier scholars who have expounded this theory over the last century. This “unconventional” date predominated in the studies dedicated to the ecclesiastical history of Spalatum-Split, yet even in cases such as this the “late” dating was less than universally accepted in Croatian and former Yugoslav historiography. For a long time the years 614 and 641 were a conventional *terminus* for the collapse of Early Christian dioceses in Dalmatia, only to be once again suddenly and inexplicably represented in historical sources around 800. Under what circumstances did Dalmatian early medieval bishoprics originate and how they evolved remained for the most part unexplained. Considering as particularly encouraging the suggestions of the authors who have pointed to signatures of four Dalmatian bishops in the proceedings of the Second church council of Nicaea, I analyze data from this meeting, as well as other sources for the earliest ecclesiastical history of Dalmatian cities. The Acts of the Council were signed by John of Salona-Split, Lawrence of Osor, Ursus of Rab, and John of Kotor. Relying on the results of my analysis, I will try to connect the historical records of several Dalmatian dioceses from the end of the 8th c. with artistic material firmly dated to the same period and preserved in the respective church buildings. I will attempt to relate this to the circulation of relics of Constantinopolitan origin in Dalmatia on the eve of the Aachen peace treaty. Finally, with respect to the accepted chronology and circumstances of military and political events on the Adriatic between 787 and 812, I will outline a possible context for the foundation (or re-establishment) of Dalmatian dioceses at that time. In conclusion, I propose that most of the early medieval dioceses in Dalmatia were (re-)established in the second half of the 8th c. following Charlemagne's conquest of the Lombard kingdom and the beginning of the dispute between the Franks and the Byzantines. It thus seems reasonable to conclude that Frankish-Byzantine “competition” for the cities of the Dalmatian littoral started earlier (in the late 770s-early 780s instead of 805) and lasted longer than is usually held, only to be definitively resolved in favor of Byzantium by 812.

Rome and the Heritage of Ancient Illyricum in the Ninth Century

Maddalena Betti

During the second half of the ninth century, the papacy directed its attention to Central Europe (the Danube region) and southeastern Europe. It built and managed an extensive diplomatic network, primarily involving the Slavic leaders who ruled the region. It reacted positively to the requests of political leaders asking for papal assistance in establishing independent ecclesiastical institutions in their territories to the detriment of the interests of the neighboring dioceses, both Greek and Frankish. It intervened in ecclesiastical matters in Dalmatia to renew the jurisdictional dependence of the Dalmatian churches on Rome. My paper will focus on the wide papal missionary program, highlighting the topics which were adopted by the Apostolic See to oppose the resistance of the Bavarian churches (Methodian Church) and the Church of Byzantium (Bulgarian Church). Indeed, in geographically different contexts the papacy adopted the same topic, i.e., the recovery of Roman jurisdictional rights which had been given to the church of Rome in Late Antiquity, for the whole diocese of Illyricum. This argument was strongly used both during the jurisdictional conflict with the Franks over the ecclesiastical organization of Pannonia (after the collapse of the Avar Empire) and during the dispute with the Church of Byzantium for the control of the Balkans, then under the control of Bulgarians and Slavs. Thus, I will try to offer a brief excursus of some symbolic passages (especially in papal letters and the *Liber Pontificalis*) which help to highlight the arguments of the Apostolic See and both the Frankish and Byzantine protests against the papal argument for the heritage of Illyricum.

I will also discuss the presence (or the absence) of evidence which could testify to papal diplomatic activity in Illyricum in the first half of the ninth century. My aim is to consider the development of the papal tradition of contacts with the region that still stood, albeit in reduced form, at the time of Pope Gregory the Great. My considerations can clarify the possibility of Roman intervention and the strategies adopted by the Apostolic See in a broader chronological framework. In this context I shall try to interpret the peace of Aachen as an important moment which favored the revival of the idea of a “Roman” Illyricum, i.e., as part of the Roman patriarchate. Finally, I will discuss the scarce information about the Roman reaction to the peace of Aachen at the time of Pope Leo III (795-816).

Slavs and Romans on the Adriatic Arc Before and After the Treaty of Aachen

Francesco Borri

This paper will focus on the Frankish and Byzantine descriptions of the ethnic geography of the Adriatic Arc, particularly Dalmatia. The *Royal Frankish Annals* and, later, Constantine Porphyrogenitus' work, together with other witnesses, offers a complicated and rich landscape of overlapping ethonyms in the region. The presence of many groups with names of Slavic origin can be noted, but also Franks and Romans. Groups called *Dalmatini* and *homines Latini* are among them. This situation presents a striking novelty if compared to the condition of late Roman Dalmatia. Modern historiography, following Emperor Constantine's notorious passages, explained these transformations through the pattern of migration, conquest, and violence. I will discuss these changes according to models of the transformation of the Roman World, keeping in mind the increasing role of the Adriatic Sea as an exchange route between the Eastern Mediterranean and Central Europe in the years of the Peace of Aachen. Particular focus will be dedicated to the identity, origins, and, if possible, roles, of the groups the sources call Romans.

One more Renaissance? Dalmatia in the Light of Michael McCormick's Thesis about the Revival of the European Economy

Neven Budak

With his voluminous and fascinating book on the origins of European economy, Michael McCormick offers medievalists a set of theses for discussion. One of his main points is that around the year 800 the European economy started new growth. Western economies and societies were once again linked to the Middle East, with Western ships carrying goods in both directions. New markets appeared on river banks and beaches, with Venice playing an ever-more-important role. The goal of this paper is to investigate whether there is any evidence for Dalmatia participating in this revival. Recently, different authors have expressed opinions about the "awakening" of life in the province at the end of the 8th century. Can these opinions be accepted and perhaps supported by new arguments?

Aquileia at the time of the Treaty of Aachen: The Patriarchate and its Hagiography

Marianna Cerno

Since its very beginning, the Church of Aquileia promoted missionary work in Pannonia and Dalmatia, and maintained intense connections with the Croatian area. At the time of the Pax Nicephori, at the beginning of the ninth century, Aquileia still had a network of religious and cultural relations with the eastern Adriatic. The internal situation of the region of Aquileia, characterized by a two-headed Church and by the presence of the Franks and Byzantines in the area, is also reflected in the local hagiographical production. Two of the most important texts of this period come from the metropole of Aquileia, then officially called the patriarchate. The important *Passion of Hermacoras and Fortunatus* tells the story of the first bishop of Aquileia and his deacon and also the story of Hilarius and Tatianus, the second bishop of the patriarchate and his deacon. The two hagiographies are similar to each other and have, for different reasons, strong links with Pannonia, Dalmatia, and Illyricum, relating in particular to the literary sources and the narrative structure. The first text, in fact, is tied tightly and still mysteriously to the narrative about the martyrdom of the Pannonian saints Donatus, Venustus, and Hermogenes (this text derives in turn from the hagiography of Pollio of Cibali). The second text, the *Passio of Hilarius and Tatianus*, also owes part of the text to Hermogenes; the first part follows the quite unknown story of Ananias, a martyr of Phoinike, a city located near Lake Butrinti that was rich at the time of the Roman Empire and then became a small town in Late Antiquity before being abandoned in the Middle Ages.

Post-Roman Dalmatia: Collapse and Regeneration of a Complex Social System

Danijel Dzino

The Late Classical Roman province of Dalmatia can easily be defined as a complex social system. From written and material sources it is not difficult to find evidence for the specialized social and economic roles of its the population and reliance on symbolic and abstract communication. Sometime in the early seventh century, most certainly during the reign of East Roman Emperor Heraclius (610-641), this system disintegrated and came to an end. For more than century and a half, the history of the larger part of post-Roman Dalmatia (in the sense of the ancient Roman province) plunged into darkness and obscurity, with exception of a few isolated areas on the coast and in the immediate hinterland. This region appeared again on the horizon of historical events in the early ninth century. Its division in 812 between the Carolingian and Byzantine empires, after the peace of Aachen, reflects the regeneration of a complex social system in Dalmatia which became more and more visible during the ninth century. The collapse of Roman Dalmatia in the late sixth and seventh century is attested in written and archaeological sources and an earlier historiography that usually explained it as a consequence of the large-scale migration of the Slavs and Avars and the subsequent settlement of the Croats and Serbs. Modern historiography has recently started to challenge such a view on the grounds of insufficient and contradictory evidence deriving mostly from later sources, in particular the notion of a population torrent flooding post-Roman Dalmatia with Slavs. While population movements in this period cannot be excluded, it is more likely that migration into Dalmatia was quantitatively modest and the survival of the descendents of the Classical population were much more important for understanding this period.

This paper will discuss the reasons for the collapse of a complex social system in late Classical Dalmatia and look into the beginnings of its regeneration in “Dark Age” Dalmatia around the seventh and eighth century. While the paucity and different contextual significance of the available sources significantly limits the scope of such an enquiry, it still leaves enough room for examination of this problem in a broad outline. It is certainly not the intention of this paper to provide comprehensive answers to the questions of collapse and regeneration in post-Roman Dalmatia. Rather, it will provide another angle for looking into this complex process of historical transition and contribute to wider debates on cultural and social transformations in post-Roman Europe and around the Mediterranean.

Aachen, Venezia e l'archeologia

Sauro Gelichi

Non vi è dubbio che ci sia almeno una coincidenza temporale tra il trattato di Aachen e la nascita e lo sviluppo di Venezia. Come è noto, secondo le fonti scritte (Giovanni diacono, *Historia Veneticorum*, II 29) sarebbe stato proprio in quegli anni che la sede ducale venne trasferita da Metamauco in Rivoalto, dando vita e stabilità locazionale ad uno spazio che diverrà la futura Venezia. L'interesse dei Franchi verso queste zone, tuttavia, era noto da tempo: invano Carlo Magno aveva tentato di controllare direttamente l'arcipelago lagunare. Le stesse aristocrazie venetiche, proprio nel periodo a cavallo tra VIII e IX secolo, avevano oscillato tra una fedeltà filo-bizantina e un'adesione al nuovo potere franco. In quegli anni, dunque, anche a seguito del trattato di Aachen tra Franchi e Bizantini, le isole della laguna (e con esse la *civitas rivoaltina*) acquisirono un'importanza sempre più crescente nel commercio adriatico e nell'economia dell'Europa carolingia. Ma che cos'erano Venezia e la laguna in questo periodo? Come si rappresentava questa conseguita centralità della città e degli insediamenti contermini (nelle sue varie declinazioni) attraverso i resti materiali? E quali sono le tracce archeologiche di questo periodo di transizione? di fatto: quale contributo ha fornito (o può fornire) l'archeologia per conoscerlo e comprenderlo meglio? Scopo di questo intervento è dunque quello di verificare se tali fonti esistono e, nel caso, di discuterne la natura, la consistenza e la qualità; infine, di valutare a che cosa sono state (o possono essere) utili. Affronterò questo argomento da tre punti di vista... Poiché l'archeologia in laguna ha conosciuto varie stagioni che hanno prodotto risultati scientifici fortemente diseguali, il primo obiettivo sarà quello di discutere il tipo di archeologia praticata dalla fine dell'800 fino ai nostri giorni e, soprattutto, di individuare quali specifici orientamenti culturali ed interpretativi l'abbiano caratterizzata nel corso del tempo. La seconda parte sarà dedicata a riconoscere e discutere quei dati archeologici che possono essere utili per comprendere meglio l'abitato originario (la *civitas rivoaltina*): forma e consistenza dell'insediamento, organizzazione e strutturazione degli spazi, caratteri della 'cultura materiale'. In questa occasione, si discuterà la fonte archeologica anche in relazione ad alcuni stereotipi interpretativi, come la 'bizantinità' della laguna. Inoltre, si tenterà di comparare tali dati con quelli relativi all'urbanesimo italico alto-medievale, per individuare in che cosa Venezia fosse simile e in che cosa, invece, fosse differente. Infine, vorrei tentare di utilizzare i dati materiali per discutere un ultimo punto, quello relativo alle dinamiche insediative lagunari tra V e IX secolo e di relazionarle con un quadro territoriale più ampio, quello nord adriatico. La

possibilità di analizzare questi processi a varie scala di grandezza (topografica e cronologica) dovrebbe consentirci di comprender meglio anche i 'tempi' e i 'modi' in cui si compì la faticosa svolta degli inizi del IX secolo: in conclusione rispondere alla domanda se e in che forme il trattato di Aachen ebbe ripercussioni percepibili in quella che poi diventerà la documentazione archeologica di questi luoghi.

Lower Pannonia Before and After the Treaty of Aachen

Hrvoje Gračanin

This paper endeavours to survey and analyze the main historical processes in Lower Pannonia during the first decades of the 9th century. The focus will be on the circumstances that led to the creation of new political realities in the Middle Danube area in the late 8th and the early 9th centuries, on the establishment of a new polity in the area bounded by the Sava, Drava, and Danube rivers under Frankish tutelage as to serve their overall strategic interests, and on the clash between the recently formed Slavic elite under the Lower Pannonian *dux* Liudevit and his Frankish overlords. Special attention will be paid to the question of whether Frankish-Byzantine relations influenced the Frankish military-political solutions for the area bounded by the Sava, Drava, and Danube, and to what extent *dux* Liudevit's conspiring with, as it turned out, the pro-Byzantine Patriarch Fortunatus of Grado may have been construed by the Frankish authorities as a potential threat to their overall position in the Adriatic-Danube region.

It is contended that the Frankish thrust into the Middle Danube area may have served several major purposes: securing the eastern frontier of the Frankish realm and strengthening the Frankish position in the wider region. If Charlemagne and his advisors enjoyed well-informed insight into the situation in Southeast Europe, the attack against the Avars may also be seen as a sort of a preemptive step to forestall any similar action either by the Byzantines or by the Bulgars at some point in the future. Moreover, this brought a large portion of the territory that had once belonged to the Roman Empire under Frankish sway, thus giving more substance to Charlemagne's claim to the *renovatio Imperii Romani*. Finally, it gave the Franks the opportunity to deepen and intensify their policy towards regional Slavic groups.

The provisions of the Treaty of Aachen presumably also affected the region bounded by the Sava, Drava, and Danube rivers, which by that time had likely been already been organized in the Principality of Lower Pannonia, although the sources are silent on this. It may even be that the Frankish authority in this region was now, if not officially at least tacitly, recognized by the Byzantines. However, it would seem that the rebellion of *dux* Liudevit provided them on the surface with a chance to challenge the Frankish dominance. The course and details of the rebellion warrant re-examination especially in light of the fact that Constantine Porphyrogenitus attributed the responsibility for the total collapse of the Byzantine influence on the East Adriatic coast and in the western Balkans to the Byzantine Emperor Michael II (820-829), contemporary with the rebellion.

Creating the Monumental Landscape of Istria and the Croatian Principality at the Turn of the Eighth century: The Role of Ecclesiastical and Social Elites

Miljenko Jurković

After the Frankish occupation of Istria, the monumental landscape of the region changed dramatically. The new elites supplied a series of large investments, mostly in churches and fortified *castra*, which had different forms (and functions) from those traditional in the province. A large scale building campaign affected strategic points along the Roman road from Trieste to Pula (Dvigrad, Bale, Guran...) and along the transversal road from Rovinj to Bale; a new bishopric was established in Novigrad. After a few decades the old bishoprics in Poreč and Pula were surrounded by Carolingian possessions, thus reinforcing the new political situation. A similar process took place in the former province of Dalmatia a few decades later. After the first wave of diplomatic preparations at the same time and in the same way as in Istria, large scale building activity took place connected to the strongholds of the Croatian elites, once again using forms and functions that were not usual in the province.

Dalmatian Bishops at the Council of Nicea in 787 and the Status of the Dalmatian Church in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries

Predrag Komatina

According to the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council held in Nicaea in 787, several bishops from Dalmatia were present, namely, the bishops of Salona/Split, Arba/Rab, Apsara/Osor, and Dekatera/Kotor. This fact has often been cited as evidence supporting the thesis that at that time the bishops of Dalmatia were subject to the patriarch of Constantinople and that measures of Emperor Leo III against the rights and jurisdiction of the Church of Rome in 732 included Dalmatia as well. Nevertheless, it has been overlooked that this council was an *ecumenical* council, at which bishops from every part of the Christian *Oecumenē* participated. Thus, the presence of bishops from Dalmatia does not immediately imply that they were suffragans of the patriarch of Constantinople. In fact, after close examination and analysis of the place of the signatures of these bishops on the Acts of the Council, especially on the concluding act – the *Horos* of the Council -- amongst the signatures of all the attendees, it can be deduced that the position of the bishops of Dalmatia at the Council was similar to the position of the bishops of the Church of Cyprus and differed from the position of the bishops from the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate. The Church of Cyprus was an *autocephalous church*, not subordinate to the patriarchate of Constantinople. It is thus clear that the bishops from Dalmatia were also present at the council as representatives of a church independent from that of Constantinople.

Not a single Dalmatian bishopric was ever mentioned in the *notitiae* of the Church of Constantinople in the 8th and 9th centuries, not even in the lists which enumerate the bishoprics of the Western provinces taken from Rome in 732 and later. Thus, the Church of Dalmatia remained part of the Church of Rome throughout the 8th and 9th centuries. It was only after Emperor Basil I gained supreme power over Croatia in 870, especially after he placed his client Sedeslav on the Croatian throne in 878, that he attempted to subordinate the Church of both Dalmatia and Croatia to the patriarchate of the imperial city. Such an attempt is evident from the letters of the Pope John VIII to the Dalmatian bishops and clergy and to the new Croatian Prince Branimir from June 879. From the same letters is also evident that the emperor's attempt was short-lived, for both Dalmatians and Croatians soon expressed their loyalty to the Apostolic See of St. Peter.

Aquileia and Grado “between” Aachen and Constantinople and the Frankish-Byzantine treaty of 812

Harald Krahwinkler

The metropolitan territory of Aquileia – the centre of the Roman province of Venetia et Histria -- extended far into Alpine and Danubian areas on the northern periphery of the Adriatic from late antiquity. The de facto establishment of two “patriarchates” claiming to be the true “Aquileia” (Aquileia/Cividale and Grado) characterised the ecclesiastical situation at the time of the Frankish-Byzantine treaty of 812.

In order to analyse this situation, some key documents provide a focus: the so-called *placitum* of Riziano (804, confirmed by Louis the Pious in 815), the so-called “testament” of Charlemagne (probably spring 811), the imperial diploma defining the Drau River (Drava) as the border between the dioceses of Aquileia and Salzburg in Carantania (previously Noricum mediterraneum) (June 811, confirmed by Louis the Pious in December 819), the so-called “testament” (*commonitorium*) of Patriarch Fortunatus of Grado (825), and the protocol of the synod of Mantua (827).

In the year 811 – due to political and personal circumstances – Charlemagne displayed particular interest in settling matters in the south and southeast of the Carolingian Empire. From the point of view of ecclesiastical organisation the position of Salzburg – established as a metropolitan see (of Bavaria) as late as 798 – was of great importance. Patriarch Fortunatus of Grado (803-c. 825) was indeed a prominent bishop “between East and West.” Fortunately literary sources of different genres shed light on this colourful political and ecclesiastical figure whose position was deeply affected by the Frankish-Byzantine treaty of 812.

The Treaty of Aachen 812 and *aemulatio imperii* on the Southeastern Frontiers of the Carolingian World

Ivan Majnarić

In the last twenty years European medieval historians have produced significant results in the study of the Carolingian period. In doing so, not only were some of the past, often stereotypical, views overcome, but entirely new methodological models with refreshing ideas were also created, thus making an important shift away from the field of political history. The intention of this paper is to address one of these new methodological models which refers to the process of the transformation of *gentes* into *regna* and the idea of *aemulatio imperii*. The idea has been elaborated by Evangelos Chrysos (*Regna and Gentes*, volume 13 of the series Transformation of the Roman World), who viewed the shaping of early medieval *regna* as having three phases, each closely connected with the Roman Empire. Although his idea refers to the period of the late Roman Empire, I will explore the possibility of applying its determining characteristics to the position of the “peoples” on the southeastern frontier of the Carolingian Empire, especially after the collapse of the Avar Khaganate during the 790s, and the possible impact the Treaty of Aachen had on the process of *aemulatio imperii*.

The Treaty of Aachen will be considered from two aspects: its importance for Charlemagne, and its cultural/political significance for the areas on the southeastern frontiers of the Carolingian Empire, especially in respect to the Carolingian world. These two aspects will be linked to the prevailing historiographical views about the meaning of the Treaty of Aachen for the Croatian historical regions.

Franks and Bulgarians in the First Half of the Ninth Century

Angel Nikolov

This presentation discusses the core aspects of the communication between the Franks and the Bulgarians in the first half of the 9th century (i.e., before the Christianisation of the Bulgarians): missions, border conflicts, and peace treaties. It outlines the role of the Bulgarian state, enlarged under Khan Krum and his descendants, as a peculiar buffer zone between Byzantium and the Frankish Empire in the region of Southeast Europe. The close relations between Bulgarians and Franks during this period allow one to assume that Frankish models might have been taken into consideration when the practice was being introduced to the peripheral territories of Bulgaria inhabited by various tribes (now transformed into *comitates*), to be administered by *comites* who were directly subordinate to the Bulgarian ruler.

Aquisgrana 812: Le premesse degli equilibri alto-adriatici e del ruolo di Venezia

Gherardo Ortalli

Le tradizionali letture degli equilibri dell'Alto Adriatico tra VIII e IX secolo con esito finale nel secolo X vedevano una sorta di faticosa e contrastata, ma comunque piuttosto lineare, crescita del ruolo di Venezia, con momenti difficili e periodi di crisi, ma senza scansioni davvero radicali. Io stesso in miei lavori nemmeno molto vecchi mi muovevo in buona misura lungo questa linea interpretativa consolidata da tempo. Del resto la tradizione documentaria riferibile a Venezia, con alle spalle decenni di studi da parte di storici di prim'ordine su fonti da molto tempo note, non offriva materiali per vere novità. Aggiustamenti e ripensamenti erano possibili ma pur sempre marginali. Soltanto l'analisi dei materiali offerti dallo studio del territorio (archeologia in primo luogo) ha consentito qualche decisa nuova proposta. In questa nuova prospettiva l'accordo franco-bizantino dell'812 diventa l'assoluta chiave di volta per una nuova capacità d'azione della nascente realtà veneziana. Proprio sulla scorta dell'accordo di Aquisgrana potrà consolidarsi infatti non soltanto l'autonomia lagunare rispetto alla terraferma di cultura feudo-vassallatica (cosa nota da tempo), ma anche la possibilità d'azione destinata a portare rapidamente Venezia a posizioni egemoniche nell'Alto Adriatico.

Circles Overlapping in the Upper Adriatic (Keynote Address)

Jonathan Shepard

A. The phenomenon of Byzantium is increasingly attracting attention from students of contemporary international history (rather than merely from medievalists) because it involves topics currently of concern to them: the swift emergence, the brittleness, and the decline of 'superpowers'; the dynamics of, and interaction between, overlapping Circles of power, political culture, commerce and faith zones; and the many ways in which 'soft power' can substitute for 'hard power' and perpetuate hegemony of a sort. My current research is partly in response to requests for comparative studies from modernists, but it also encompasses the problem of the Germanic peoples in Italy from the 9th to the 12th centuries; Constantine VII's *De administrando imperio*; and the constants and variables of Byzantine geopolitics from the era of Justinian until 1204. The lattermost topic has, among its main themes, Byzantium's fairly constant preoccupation with an eastern superpower, occasional preoccupation with major powers in the Balkans and East-Central Europe, and unflagging reservation for itself of rights, 'entitlement' and footholds in the Christian west. Hindering the establishment of any substantive imperial regime in the city of Rome was axiomatic to this policy and, by means of a motley assortment 'bunkers', Open Cities, 'chokepoints' and communications-hubs, Byzantium maintained a plausible semblance of worldwide hegemony. Taking 'the long view' across many centuries is worthwhile, because that is what Byzantine statecraft itself tried to do. This did not quite amount to a 'Grand Strategy', but it did involve awareness of the constants of geopolitics, and the importance of precedents, as witness Constantine VII's choice – implemented by aides – of subject-matter and area-studies in his *De legationibus*. In fact his writings offer invaluable aperçus of past and present calculus of the Byzantines about power-balances, communications-hubs, economic resource-centres and, even, about soft power (whose allure Constantine takes for granted, while denouncing allegedly sloppy usage of it). Constantine does not explicitly mention either the coronation of Charlemagne in Rome or the Treaty of Aachen – perhaps from sheer ignorance or disinclination to perpetuate the record of unpalatable events, but perhaps rather because Charlemagne, a northern-based *monokrator*, had not installed himself permanently in Rome, and did not appear particularly ideologically challenging. Constantine's attention to Charlemagne's patronage of building-works in Jerusalem is, however, noteworthy. So, too, is his interest in those peoples and elites with a proven record of resisting the Franks and the Bulgarians...

B. The interest shown by Constantine VII's *De administrando* in the Croats, the Dalmatian coastline as a whole, and the Upper Adriatic, in particular brings us to the subject-matter of this Conference. I shall not treat in much detail the course of events between 800 and 812. My concern is rather with how they seem to fit into 'the long view' (or *longue durée*), and with how they illustrate the workings of Byzantine diplomacy and fore-mentioned themes such as Open Cities, soft power and the *basileus'* insistence on his unique centrality within a Circle encompassing western Christendom south of the Alps, an insistence greatly fortified by a durable presence in the Upper Adriatic. This is not to deny the audaciousness of Charlemagne's achievement or its irreversible elements: destruction of Lombard and then of Avar power, and attaining a new, imperial, dimension for his dynasty's hegemony through ceremonial endorsement from the Roman papacy. However, Charlemagne was far from being the first Frankish warlord with whom Roman emperors had had to treat. Nor were the events of the early ninth century the first occasion of their application of soft power to the Upper Adriatic. It therefore seems worthwhile to glance back at earlier instances, noting both similarities and differences.

C. Establishing Constantinople as the incontestable centre of its own Circle while proclaiming the 'restoration' of the Roman empire was the aim of Justinian. For this purpose he created an imperial presence in the west, a presence not so much ephemeral as ethereal, ambivalent, geographically scattered – and therefore all the more difficult for foes or rivals to expunge or exorcise. While still possessing substantial reserves of hard power, Justinian systematically resorted to soft power. Through such projects as his much-trumpeted buildings-programme, he laid down markers for a Roman empire that could endure without abundant material means, or intensive garrisoning of military outposts. He and his successors were attentive to local elites, including ecclesiastical ones; quite lavish with payment of subsidies in coins that could serve as advertisements of their ubiquity to barbarian elites; and envisaging manifold exchanges between re-'Romanised' footholds and the populations of their hinterlands, contacts involving trade. In light of these general propositions, one may consider Justinian's dealings with the Franks, potentially useful allies in restoring the semblance of imperial hegemony in Italy, yet truculent and ever liable to remind him that their interrelationship rested on mutual advantage and partnership, not the deference of one party to the other. Justinian wished to reserve for himself dominion over Rome. But he also sought to establish an indelible imperial presence in the Upper Adriatic, whose significance as a resource-centre and platform for diplomatic initiatives he came to appreciate. The effect was to lay down challenges to the credentials of all future prospective masters of the Po basin and of Rome, requiring them to come to terms with the one true emperor.

D. Against this stage set essentially in the 6th, one may view the scenario in the early 9th century in the Upper Adriatic, Rome and beyond. First and foremost the perspective of Charlemagne. After his victories over Lombards and Avars and in quest of lasting validation of his hegemony bestowed by the papacy, he still had to reckon with an eastern imperial presence impinging from virtually all directions, and exerting attractions on variety of regional elites. Hindering communications with Constantinople, through occupation of Venice and the Dalmatian towns, could do something to counter that presence, and was a prime reason for the Carolingians' efforts to subjugate them. Paradoxically, their failure to do so made well-publicised ceremonial recognition of Charlemagne's imperial status by Byzantine envoys at Aachen all the more urgent to him. Secondly, and by way of further illuminating Charlemagne's perspective, one may note the combination of hard and soft power which the eastern emperors deployed against him in the Upper Adriatic in the early 9th c. The church of the Holy Trinity may itself prove to be an example of such soft power, while the apparent change in Zadar's role soon afterwards might exemplify the ease with which a place could shift from being 'bunker' to Open City.

E. One may, finally, consider how in the ninth and tenth centuries Byzantium maintained a policy of treating Venice and Rome as, in effect, Open Cities, fostering their autonomous tendencies in order to hold third parties at arm's length. The Franks were foremost amongst such parties, yet imperial statecraft still rated them as potentially useful military partners of a high order, as they had been in the 6th century and also in Charlemagne's day. In Constantine VII's writings, especially the *De administrando*, one may find a rationale for this policy and hints of plans for restoring imperial dominion over Sicily and also, at the time of writing of the *De administrando*, for accommodating another influx of Franks into Italy, and their current dominion over Aquileia. The role of the Upper Adriatic in the imperial calculus becomes clearer in light of the circumstances in which the *De administrando* was composed. Constantine's respect for Charlemagne as victorious warlord is tempered by his awareness of the Franks' geopolitical limitations. If Southern Italy and Rome lay beyond their permanent reach, this was in no small measure due to the eastern empire's continuing attractions for members of elites in Venice and Dalmatian towns. Such were the dynamics that enabled the emperor to insist on his centrality within a Circle encompassing Ravenna and Rome, and to maintain the semblance of worldwide hegemony. Sensitivity to this is implicit in the *De administrando*'s treatment of the Upper Adriatic and there is implicit awareness of the value there of soft power. From this perspective, the events of the early 9th century still appeared highly relevant in the mid-10th, and one may note in this light the presentation of gifts by Constantine's emissary to the church of Jerusalem.

Patriarchs and Patrons: Textual Sources, Material Evidence and the Attribution of the *Ciboria* in *Santa Maria delle Grazie* at Grado

Magdalena Skoblar

During the turbulent events in the north Adriatic which preceded the Treaty of Aachen, Patriarch Fortunatus went into exile on account of his pro-Frankish inclinations and the see of Grado was left empty. In his absence, it was occupied by John, who is usually referred to as Iohannes Iunior in the written sources. As is obvious from John the Deacon's *Chronicon Venetum*, John Junior wasted no time in embarking on the decoration of the churches in Grado. He had the cathedral apse furnished with marble columns and panels in honour of the martyrs whose relics were venerated there. An architrave fragment which still survives may have belonged to this structure, as can be deduced from its inscription which mentions IOHANNES IVNIOR. According to Tavano, it can be linked to three other fragments, the reconstructed text of which reads: +AD HONORE BEATI MARCI E(vagelist)E IOHANNES IVNIOR SOLA D(ei) SVFFRAGANTE GRATIA D(...) IND(ictione). John's second recorded commission was an altar ciborium in the church of Santa Maria delle Grazie. Three ciborium arches discovered in this church, bearing no inscription, have nonetheless been identified by Italian scholars as the remains of John Junior's documented ciborium. My paper discusses the remains of this ciborium but also the remains of another ciborium which has been attributed to Patriarch Fortunatus, all of which are displayed in Santa Maria delle Grazie. It is frequently forgotten that this display was assembled by Vigilio De Grassi, a local architect responsible for the 1920s excavation and restoration of the church.

The paper also examines the historiography of these sculptures in order to establish how and why they became associated with the information from the *Chronicon*. I also discuss the validity of such an identification and its consequences for an art historical analysis of sculpture from the north and east Adriatic. While as recently as 2005, Italian researchers interpreted these three ciborium arches as belonging to John Junior's ninth-century ciborium; in 2006, Jakšić attributed them to the eleventh century on the basis of stylistic analysis. I will also compare John Junior's commissioning activities to those recorded in the so-called testament of Patriarch Fortunatus which contains a long list of donations and building initiatives he carried out upon his return to Grado.

A Resurgent Empire? Byzantium in the Early 800's

Panos Sophoulis

The late eighth and early ninth century is generally viewed as a turning point in the history of the Byzantine Empire, marking the transition from the so-called “Dark Ages” to the apogee of medieval Byzantium under the Macedonian dynasty. Indeed, during this period, especially from the reign of Nikephoros I onwards (802-811), the empire clearly entered an era of economic recovery, military consolidation, and slow -- albeit stable -- territorial expansion. However, at the same time it continued to experience serious difficulties, as political machinations occupied much of the attention of the governing circles, and aggressive neighbours – the Abbāsids in the East, Charlemagne in the Adriatic and the Bulgars in the northeastern Balkans – exerted pressure on its borders and beyond. Against this background, it is important to reevaluate Byzantium’s strategic goals abroad, and question whether, given the circumstances, the empire was ultimately successful in dealing with these threats. In an attempt to provide an answer, this paper will unravel the forces – political, social, military – that shaped imperial policies from ca. 780 to 812.

The Balkans in Byzantine Texts of the 9th and 10th Centuries: Attitudes and Concepts in the View of the Relations between Constantinople, Rome and the Franks after the Peace of Aachen

Vlada Stanković

With the 812 Peace Treaty of Aachen, Byzantium recognized the existence of another empire and with it, at least to some extent, a clear division of spheres with the new power in the West. On the practical level on the ground, that division was in the greatest measure introduced on the northern Dalmatian coast and its hinterland, where the Byzantines had to accept the new political reality that included drawing a clear borderline between the Greeks in the coastal town centers and the Slavic population in their hinterlands, between the subjects of the Byzantine Empire in the former, and the Frankish state in the latter case. The consequences of these developments affected Byzantium's political and spiritual influence or dominance in the western Balkan areas.

It was this set of events that prompted increased awareness in Byzantium of the importance of relations with the West and provoked intensified interest in the political developments in these distant provinces, which were examples of new political trends that pervaded both the complex relations in the triangle Constantinople – Rome – the Franks and a power struggle among them. This paper will analyze the reverberations of this new political reality after the Aachen Peace Treaty that can be traced, be it only vaguely and in allusions, in Byzantine texts of the 9th and, partly, the 10th century. The focus will be placed on Byzantine conceptual attitudes regarding the right of the empire to govern both the disputed territories and the Balkans in general, and on the Byzantine understanding of the new kind of the relations that were developing with the West, particularly with Rome. This led to some quite unexpected attitudes in Constantinople about the connections between the Old and the New Rome.

811: Frieden in Aachen für die Völker im Karpatenbecken – Vorgeschichte und Folgen

Béla Miklós Szóke

Im Jahre 811 berichtet der Autor der Reichsannalen, dass Karl der Große in Aachen eine Reichsversammlung abhält und dann je ein Heer in drei Teile seines Reiches befiehlt. Das eine Heer verwüstet das Land des Stammes der Linonen jenseits der Elbe, das andere Heer zieht in *Pannonias*, um den Zwistigkeiten zwischen Hunnen (Awaren) und Slawen ein Ende zu bereiten, und das dritte zieht gegen die Bretonen, um sie wegen ihrer Untreue zu bestrafen. Karl kehrt Mitte November nach Aachen zurück, als „auch aus Pannonien Männer nach Aachen gekommen waren, der Canizauci, der Awarenfürst, der Tudun und noch andere Vornehme und Herzoge der an der Donau ansässigen Slawen, welche von den Heerführern der nach Pannonien befehligten Truppen vor den Fürsten geladen waren.“ In den philologischen Erklärungsversuchen zum Würdennamen *canizauci* ist vielleicht der einzige gemeinsame Punkt, dass es sich bei dem Namen um ein Kompositum handelt. Die eine Gruppe der Erklärungen bringt den Namen mit den Hunnen, Türken und Uiguren, der andere, größere Teil mit den Donaubulgaren in Zusammenhang. Der Anführer der in Aachen erscheinenden awarischen Gesandtschaft ist mit großer Sicherheit nicht der Khagan, und noch weniger der bulgarische Krum Khan oder der sich mit dessen Titel heimtückisch schmückende awarische Fürst. Nach Lajos Ligeti ist es solch ein Würdentitel, dessen erstes Glied, der *qan*, „im Gegensatz zum hohen Fürstentitel des Bajan, mit dem *qayan* steht, dieser erscheint jedoch auch noch in 811 als hochtrabend“, das zweite Glied des Titels jedoch ist der gut bekannte türkische *sabčī*, *saβčī*, *savčī* mit der Bedeutung 'Gesandter'. Die von dem „Gesandten des Khagan“ (Canisauci) angeführte Gesandtschaft bezeugt das normale Funktionieren des Khaganats, das den durch die Neuordnung der Verhältnisse innerhalb des Karpatenbeckens entstandenen neuen *status quo* akzeptiert. Die wichtigste Folge der Verhandlungen und das Pfand für einen dauerhaften Frieden war, dass man das Gebiet zwischen der Donau und der Save vom ehemaligen awarischen Khaganat löste, und mit dem Namen *Pannonia(e)* unmittelbar zu einer karolingischen Provinz machte. Das Drave-Save-Zwischenstromgebiet mit dem Zentrum *Siscia* ist *Pannonia inferior*. Ihr Verwalter ist dem Dux von Friaul unmittelbar unterstellt und gehört kirchlich zum Missionsgebiet von Aquileia, während das Drave-Donau-Zwischenstromgebiet, *Pannonia superior*, unter die Regierung des bayerischen Ostpräfekten Gerold (III.) gelangt und zum Missionsbezirk der Salzburger Kirche werden wird.

La Politica Imperiale e le sue conseguenze regionali: L'Istria tra gli anni 788 e 812

Peter Štih

L'atto del Placito del Risano dell'804 mostra che il nuovo regime franco, che intorno all'anno 788 si era sostituito a quello bizantino, aveva apportato in breve tempo cambiamenti sostanziali nella vita degli Istriani. Questi cambiamenti avevano violato affondo i loro antichi diritti e le loro consuetudini. Le ragioni dell'inasprimento della situazione nella penisola non erano, come spesso si crede, condizionate dall'affermarsi del feudalesimo. La ragione principale non va ricercata nemmeno nella corruzione e nel nepotismo del duca Giovanni, dato che l'inasprimento era legato in primo luogo alla politica imperiale di Carlo Magno, per via della quale egli, nel 791, aveva iniziato una lunga guerra contro gli Avari. Per più di un decennio la guerra aveva influenzato le vicende accadute tra l'Italia e il medio Danubio: il vivere con la guerra e per la guerra aveva estenuato la regione e la sua popolazione, si erano dovute ingaggiare tutte le risorse a disposizione, adeguare l'economia e centralizzare il potere. Non aveva potuto eludere a questi cambiamenti nemmeno l'Istria, che assieme alla Baviera e al Friuli rappresentava la prima linea dell'espansione franca in Pannonia e nel medio Danubio. I provvedimenti impopolari che avevano colpito gli Istriani erano in buona parte la conseguenza dell'adeguamento dell'economia e delle istituzioni locali alle condizioni e alle esigenze della guerra. Quando però, dopo la fine della guerra avara, la bizantina Venezia era stata presa di mira dalla politica espansionistica di Carlo Magno, il crescente scontento in Istria avrebbe potuto destabilizzare l'intera area, distruggere i piani che i Franchi avevano nei confronti di Venezia e forse anche mettere a rischio la loro posizione in Istria, dove la popolazione del luogo aveva incominciato a pensare al precedente potere bizantino come ai »buoni vecchi tempi«. La sistemazione della situazione istriana era diventata nel contesto della politica che i Franchi attuavano verso Venezia e del conflitto franco-bizantino che si preannunciava una delle priorità della politica di Carlo Magno nell'Adriatico settentrionale. In questo modo in occasione della visita del metropolita istriano, il patriarca Fortunato di Grado, all'imperatore a Salz nell'estate dell'803 era stata presa la decisione di indire un placito provinciale istriano, dove nel 804, con l'abolizione di gran parte dei provvedimenti del duca Giovanni e dei vescovi locali le condizioni nella penisola si normalizzarono. La fazione profranca riuscì ancora nello stesso anno a ottenere il potere a Venezia. Quando poi, nell'805, Carlo Magno in occasione della visita dei rappresentanti dalmati e veneziani emanò l'*Ordinatio de ducibus et populis tam Venetiae quam Dalmatiae*, questo significò la formale sottomissione delle due regioni bizantine alla sua

autorità, il che portò al conflitto militare con i Bizantini nell'Adriatico settentrionale. Esso finì solo nell'812 con la pace di Aachen, che legalizzò lo status quo nell'Adriatico settentrionale: i Franchi rinunciarono definitivamente alle lagune veneziane, i Bizantini invece all'Istria. Allo stesso tempo, in Istria la pace di Aachen preannunciava un nuovo conflitto, in questo caso ecclesiastico, dato che Aquileia, inclusa con l'Istria e a differenza di Grado nell'Italia dei Franchi, esigeva di tenere nelle proprie mani l'autorità di metropolita sulla penisola.

Is it Possible to Recognise Changes in the Political Structure in the Remains of the 9th Century Village-like Settlements? The Evaluation of Archaeological Sources from the Central Parts of the Carpathian Basin

Miklós Takács

In the introduction we want to give a short review of the main tendencies in the excavation of early medieval, village-like settlements in the Carpathian Basin. The first task of the presentation will be a brief delimitation of the zones in the Carpathian basin, affected by wars or by military campaigns in the different phases of the 9th c. AD. A brief summary of the well known, many times evaluated and – unfortunately – very scarce source material is needed, because of the presence of this problem in the evaluation of the archaeological material. Second, zones in the Carpathian basin will be briefly delimited as they were affected by wars or military campaigns in different phases of the ninth century AD. The presence of this problem in the archaeological material necessitates a brief summary of well known, frequently evaluated scarce source material.

The main topic of the presentation will be a brief overview of the archaeological investigations of the ninth-century in the central and southern Carpathian Basin carried out over the last two decades. The focus will be on settlement excavations with special attention to the definition of the topography and chronology of village-like settlements. Neither the analysis of the ethnic affiliation of these settlements nor archaeological material of the centres of power will be addressed. The largely (one can also say in a too extensively) analysed problem of ethnicity can only be firmly determined in most cases based on the material of these settlement excavations. Only one centre of power has been excavated in the central parts Carpathian Basin: Zalavár (in contemporary sources: Mosaburg; in south Slavic languages: Blatnograd), which will be presented in the framework of another study at this conference. Findings from the sites of Lébény-Kaszás-domb, Kompolt-Kistéri-tanya, and others will be cited.

A loose chronological framework will be derived from the analysis of the village-like settlements dated to the ninth century AD. The tendency toward “bad” dating can usually be amended by examining the absence of signs of war damage or a sudden interruption of the life on these settlements during the ninth century, even in previously noted war-zones. The general conclusion will be drawn on the existence of village-like settlements in this region below the level of the historical events recorded in written sources.

The Peutinger Map: Carolingian Contents Connected to the Treaty of Aachen

Tin Turković

The present knowledge of Early Medieval geographical knowledge is limited, at best. The kind of map *Pax Nicephori* was negotiated over is undoubtedly an interesting question. Only a handful of scholars have turned their attention to this problem and this line of investigation is still mostly unexplored. It seems, however, that the usual perception of the Early Medieval geographical knowledge, and the cartography as one of its clearest manifestations, is far from correct. Scholars like N. Lozovsky, B. S. Bachrach, and others have clearly demonstrated that the Early Middle Ages were immeasurably better informed than is usually imagined. Just like today, geographical information was of primary interest for a warring party. Generally, early medieval cartography is depicted in terms of the so-called Beatus group of maps and the T-type maps. In contrast, late medieval cartography is different, although it stems from the same cartographic roots. One map is distinctly different from all of these medieval maps in content and shape. The so-called Peutinger's map (*Codex Vindobonensis 324*), although a panoramic, chorographic map, has many features which are strikingly different from all other medieval maps. The cartographic language employed on the map, as well as the sheer structure of the map, are unmistakably of late Classical origin. The pictorial language, manifested in various symbols, can only be compared with that of the early medieval copies of *Notitia Dignitatum* and *Corpus agrimensorum romanorum*. The structure and content are clearly compatible with the specific nature of early medieval interests in geography and at the same time are clearly incompatible with the religious-didactic preoccupation of late medieval cartographers. The majority of researchers have assumed that it was produced in the early medieval and not late medieval period. In fact, the only three figural depictions found on the map, representing the cities of Rome, Constantinople, and Antioch, when studied thoroughly, indeed provide a definite clue to the date when the content of the map was produced. In my opinion the content is distinctly early medieval, although many later additions are clearly recognizable. The name by which Jerusalem is labelled (in this case *Helya Capitolina*), the way in which Salzburg is marked, and other features are facts pointing to the early medieval provenance of the map's content. All of this information, in fact, suggests an even more precise date – beginning of the 9th century, thus the time of *Pax Nicephori*. It also illustrates the scope of Carolingian aspirations on the Eastern Adriatic shore, as will be demonstrated in the presentation.

Amalarius of Metz visit to Zadar in 813: Its Background Reconsidered

Trpimir Vedriš

The Church of Zadar found itself in a complex situation after the Treaty of Aachen, when the liturgist and imperial envoy, Amalarius of Metz, visited the town and wrote an account of his stay, *Epistula ad Hilduinum abbatem*. I will analyse a selected section of the *Epistula*, a liturgical treatise written soon after the end the mission at the request of Hilduin, abbot of St. Denis. In answer to Hilduin, Amalarius mentions his stay in Zadar, the future capital of the Byzantine *thema*, in June 813. This brief and rather unclear fragment discusses variations in liturgical customs between Amalarius and a group of Italian monks while they were travelling to Constantinople. The reference to “customs” in Zadar, sometimes interpreted as referring to the Greek rite, I prefer to understand as reflecting the difference between different Latin liturgies. This unclear text is thus both a problematic and valuable source, especially, but not exclusively, for the ecclesiastical history of Zadar and Dalmatia after the Treaty of Aachen. However, I argue that it should be interpreted not only in the broader terms of what is known about the contemporary Carolingian liturgical reform, but especially in the light of other contemporary texts such as Amalarius’ *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, the Roman *Ordines*, and the *Translatio S. Anastasiae*, the local Jadertine legend. Inquiring into the possible meaning of the notion of different liturgical customs in the *Epistula*, I will move forward towards interpreting the unclear proposal addressed to Amalarius in Zadar – namely, to ordain a local deacon to the priesthood. Trying to interpret the event in the particular context of Amalarius’ voyage to Constantinople and the broader historical context of the diplomatic activities taking place between Aachen and Constantinople in 811-814, I will address the issue of the position of the Church of Zadar and its relations to Rome at the beginning of the 9th century.

The Episcopal Complex in Zadar: The Church of St. Anastasia and the Rotund of the Holy Trinity (Guided Tour)

Pavuša Vežić

The episcopal complex consists of the cathedral, the baptistry, the sacristy, the belfry, and the bishop's palace with a garden on one side and the church of Saint Donat on the other. The Illyric Seminary, which is also a part of the complex, is situated nearby, with a courtyard alongside the cathedral. In the past, the entire complex was enclosed by tall boundary walls. Today, the wall is still partially preserved and surrounds the palace garden and the courtyard of the belfry. The square in front of the cathedral is bounded by facades of the Illyric and theological seminary. The core of this complex was built in antiquity on the edge of the Roman forum. Archaeological finds in the sacristy of the cathedral indicate the remains of an early Christian oratory from the 4th century. It was created by adapting the three *forum tabernas*. At the end of the 4th and during the 5th century, during the office of Bishop Felix, that nucleus grew into a developed episcopal complex with a basilica (traditionally believed to have been consecrated to Saint Peter, but it seems to have been both Saints Peter and Paul), with annexes: a diaconicon, baptistry, catechumeneion, episcopium, and accompanying spaces. This complex grew on the grounds of the former forum as a new insula of the city in late antiquity. The archaeological remains of the basilica, the south wall, the apse, and the floor mosaics, have been preserved until today. The baptistry is a restored facsimile; the catechumeneion has remained almost intact, serving as the cathedral sacristy. Modest remains of the original episcopium are preserved on the ground floor of the bishop's palace. During the early Middle Ages, mostly in the 9th century (at the time of Donatus, bishop of Zadar), a new architectural layer was erected in the complex. The most important element of this layer is well preserved to this day, a rotunda with a gallery. It was originally dedicated to the holy Trinity and subsequently changed to Saint Donatus. It served as the residential chapel, connected directly with the new wing of the episcopium that was erected along with the chapel. In that period, the early Christian cathedral was enriched with new liturgical content and saints' relics. The relics of Saint Anastasia, a Sirmian martyr to whom the church was later consecrated, are particularly important. It was mentioned by that name in the *De administrando imperio* in the mid-10th century by the Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII "Porphyrogenetos". The diaconicon, annexed to the south apse, and the cistern built into the ground floor of the episcopium in the space of the early Christian diaconicon are well preserved today. During the Middle Ages, after the 12th century, at the time of Archbishop

Lampridius, on the site of the original basilica a Romanesque cathedral was built, a three-aisled basilica with a crypt, elevated presbytery, matroneums (galleries) above the aisles, and a rich articulation of the façade, a side wall with an external gallery. During the 13th century it was extended to the size and shape seen today. The facade wing of the bishop's palace was also built in this period and it linked today's matrix of spacious building with the inner courtyard. The priest's building (*Canonica*) was situated next to the cathedral and the bishop's palace. It was destroyed in a fire on the night of 29 September 1394 and was never rebuilt, as reported by the Zadar chronicler, Pavao Pavlović. The sacristy of the cathedral was re-arranged in the late 14th century. In the first half of the 15th century, wooden choir stalls, well preserved until today, were installed in the presbytery of the church. In the second half of the century, during the tenure of Archbishop Vallaress, the episcopium took on new early Renaissance architectural elements (later destroyed). The belfry was also built in this period, but only to the second-floor level. During the first half of the 18th century, a new baroque building housing the Illyric seminary was built during the tenure of Archbishop Vicko Zmajević. It was built on the complex of the former priest's building, on the corner of the cathedral. The interior of the rotunda was extensively renovated. The passages to the southern addition to the building were walled in and became part of the residential buildings in front of the rotunda. Later, during the time of Archbishop Ivan Carsan, the cathedral was also renovated. Both churches received baroque interiors with the several new altars. In 1832, the metropolitan of Zadar, Josip Franjo Nowak, thoroughly redecorated the complex of the episcopium in classicist style. In 1867, during the tenure of Metropolitan Petar Dujam Maupas, a new theological seminary with neoclassical facades was built. It was erected on the site of the original seminary opposite the cathedral. A stone wall with iron grilles was built between the belfry and the cathedral in 1879. Above the door was the coat of arms of Metropolitan Maupas. In 1894 the belfry was upgraded. It was built according to the plans of the English architect, T. G. Jackson, in neo-Romanesque style.

Dangerous Neighbours: The Aftermath of the Defeat of Nicephoros I by the Bulgarians in 811

Daniel Ziemann

The Bulgarian defeat of the Byzantine army led by Emperor Nikephoros in 811 was an event that had a great and long-lasting impact on Southeast Europe. Over a long period of more or less continuous military conflicts between Byzantium and Bulgaria that started in the middle of the 8th century, the year 811 marked a significant turning point. Some decades earlier, Bulgaria had been under serious pressure during the reign of Constantine V (741-776). It had sometimes barely been able to prevent conquest and incorporation of its territory into the Byzantine Empire, leading to internal struggles as well as significant Byzantine influence at the Bulgarian court. Towards the end of the century the immediate danger of losing its political independence gradually diminished.

The situation changed drastically with two major attempts by Emperor Nikephoros to subdue Bulgaria, in 809 and 811. The catastrophic defeat of the Byzantine army, however, turned the situation upside-down. During the following years the Bulgarians, led by Khan Krum, achieved further victories on the battlefield. The important city of Mesembria on the Black Sea coast was probably conquered in 812. In 813 the Bulgarians defeated a Byzantine army near Adrianople before they finally reached the walls of Constantinople. In the same year, Adrianople was besieged and finally taken. These military successes changed not only the political situation in Byzantium but also the structure of the First Bulgarian Realm. The conquests of territories that had been part of the Byzantine Empire affected the population structure of Bulgaria as well as its cultural features. From then on, the Greek language and Christianity became significant parts of Bulgaria. One might even speak of a Byzantinization of the realm.

This paper focuses on various aspects and open questions within these events and developments. Many aspects of the military expeditions of 809 and 811 still raise unsolved questions. The paper will present a fresh look at some of the widespread opinions and allegedly solved problems. More attention needs to be paid to the long-term consequences of these events for the internal structure of Bulgaria. In fact, these developments resulted in a process that transformed the character of the whole realm more significantly than has commonly been acknowledged. It can finally be demonstrated that the role of Bulgaria in the context of the 812 treaty of Aachen has to be revised.

The Treaty of Aachen and the 'New Deal' of 813-820

Tibor Živković

The reign of Emperor Leo V (813-820) can be divided in two phases. In the first (813-815), this Byzantine ruler kept good political relations with old Patriarch Nikephoros (806-815), who addressed him asking the emperor to persist in his iconophile policy. The relations between the emperor and the patriarch depended on many factors. In that context, the peace treaty of Aachen 812 should be seen as only one of the phases of the negotiations which took place during the following three years. In that sense, the Frankish envoys, Amalarius, the bishop of Trier, and Peter, the abbot of the monastery in Nonantola, confirmed peace with the Byzantine emperor, Michael I (811-813), in the year 813. The next year the envoys of Louis the Pious, successor of Charlemagne, ratified a peace treaty referring to the Treaty of Aachen from 812 and 813. In the year 814 another treaty was signed, this time between Bulgarian Khan Krum (803-814) and the Byzantine emperor – to be valid for the next thirty years. Finally, in 815, the Frankish envoys, Bishop Nordbert (*Nordbertus episcopus*) and Duke Richoin (*Richoinus comes*) ratified a peace agreement with Constantinople.

Therefore, negotiations preceding the peace treaty between the two empires began in 812 and lasted until 815. One of the reasons for this prolonged duration of the negotiations is certainly the change on the Byzantine throne in 813. But an even more important reason is the shift from the previous iconophile ecclesiastical policy of the empire, exemplified in the person of Patriarch Nikephoros, to the new iconodoul supported by the new patriarch, Theodot, confirmed by the emperor on April 1, 815. One should also consider the fact that the new government in Constantinople appointed military comrades of Emperor Leo to important military offices. In the light of all these factors, the treaty signed in Aachen should be seen as a result of Byzantine internal politics and changes in ecclesiastical policy as well as the external diplomatic politics of the empire. It seems that the Treaty of Aachen, the legacy of Charlemagne, should not be judged as particularly important if seen in the context of the Byzantine internal situation, especially the changes in the ecclesiastical policy.

Conference was financially supported by

University of Zadar,
Department of History



Ministry of Science, Education and
Sports of the Republic of Croatia



University of Zagreb,
Faculty of Humanities and Social
Sciences, Department of History



University of Split,
Faculty of Philosophy
Department of History



Central European University,
Department of Medieval Studies
Budapest



Museum of Croatian
Archaeological Monuments
Split



Archdiocese of Zadar

